

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

Pending claims 1-11 have been examined and claims 1, and 8-11 (sic: 7-11) are rejected. Specifically, claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,205,145 to Yamazaki (hereinafter “Yamazaki”). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,564,266 to Goto et al. (hereinafter “Goto”). Additionally, claims 7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

By way of overview, Applicant overcomes the art rejections of claims 1 and 8-11, as well as the § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 7 and 10-11, as follows.

### **II. Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner indicates that claims 2-7 are allowed (Office Action: page 5). Claim 7, however, is rejected under § 112, second paragraph. Additionally, claims 10 and 11, which are rejected under § 112, second paragraph, are not otherwise rejected under any art of record.

Since Applicant overcomes the § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 7 and 10-11, as set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7 and 10-11 are in condition for immediate allowance.

**III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

As noted above, claims 7 and 10-11 stand rejected under § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner's position is that Applicant "is claiming a standard without indicating the year of the standard." Consequently, the Examiner alleges that claims 7 and 10-11 "are indefinite because standards [may] have [a] different version for a particular year" and the specification fails to indicate the year of the IEEE 1394 or the IEC 61883 standard.

It is respectfully submitted that the digital interface of claims 7 and 11 conform to all versions of the IEEE 1394 standard and the input/output plugs of claim 10 can be defined by any version of the IEC 61883 standard, such that the Examiner's conjecture that these standards may have different versions for a particular year is irrelevant. Furthermore, the Examiner fails to actually put forth any evidence that the relevant portions of these standards have varied in a manner that would support an allegation that claims 7 and 10-11 are rendered indefinite under § 112, second paragraph.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 10-11 are sufficiently definite under § 112, second paragraph, and the Examiner is thus requested to withdraw this grounds of rejection.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/626,080  
Attorney Docket No. Q59998

#### **IV. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

As noted above, claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yamazaki.

Applicant amends claim 1 to further clarify that “the connection release request command includes a plug type field which indicates a plug type of the first device in the point-to-point connection, and a plug identification field which indicates the plug identifier of the first device as operands.” Support for this amendment can be found at least on page 7, lines 11-13 of Applicant’s specification.

Yamazaki fails to disclose or suggest a connection release request command having a plug type field and a plug identification field as operands. Consequently claim 1 is not anticipated by Yamazaki. Consequently, claim 8 is not anticipated by Yamazaki at least by virtue of its dependency.

#### **V. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 9 stands rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Goto. It is respectfully submitted that Goto, like Yamazaki, fails to teach or suggest a connection release request command having a plug type field and a plug identification field as operands. Consequently, claim 9 is not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of Yamazaki in view of Goto.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/626,080  
Attorney Docket No. Q59998

#### **VI. Formal Matter – Cited References**

Despite Applicant's previous request, the Examiner has not yet provided a signed and initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 submitted with Applicant's IDS filed on September 23, 2003 or Applicant's IDS filed on May 4, 2004. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a signed and initialed copy of these forms no later than in the next correspondence.

#### **VII. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Billy Carter Raulerson  
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 3, 2004